

Sarbanes: Anechoic Chamber, Pax River Ready Reserve Fleet.

Simon: IMET provision, peacekeeping funding, contingency force peace operations, land exchange.

Wellstone: Relevant.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 92 just received from the House. I ask that it be read so that all Members will know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:.

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 92) providing for an adjournment of the two Houses.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, August 4, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, it stand adjourned until noon on Wednesday, September 6, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day beginning on Saturday, August 5, 1995, through Saturday, August 19, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, September 5, 1995, or until such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered and agreed to, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 92) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. I thank my colleague. If that took more than 1 minute, take it out of my leader's time.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Exon amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Can we get the yeas and nays on all the amendments?

Mr. EXON. I will be glad to incorporate that. I ask for the yeas and nays on all of the amendments with reference to the matter that we have been debating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. So there will be the yeas and nays on four amendments.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield back any time remaining, and I am going to move to table the Exon amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. EXON. I make an inquiry of the Chair. I thought that the yeas and nays on the Exon amendment had been ordered.

Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. EXON. Then a tabling motion would not be in order at this time, would it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that a tabling motion would be in order.

Is there a sufficient second on the tabling motion?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Exon amendment is set aside. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] is recognized to offer an amendment, on which Senator REID will control 40 minutes and Senator THURMOND will control 20 minutes.

The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 2113 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2111

(Purpose: To strike the provision designating the location of the new tritium production facility of the Department of Energy)

Mr. REID. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for himself and Mr. BRYAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2113 to amendment No. 2111: On page 29 of the amendment, strike lines 18 through 21.

Mr. REID. The record should read as on the amendment that this is offered on behalf of both Senators from Nevada.

Mr. President, I object to the section of this amendment that directs the Department of Energy to site its new tritium production facility at Savannah River.

For Members of the Senate, let me explain briefly what we are talking

about. Tritium is an element that is critical to all modern nuclear weapons. However, it is radioactive and decays. Our weapons will cease to work if we do not periodically replace the tritium. We do not now in the United States have the ability, the capability to produce tritium. We must develop a new tritium source.

We are, in this amendment, striking from this Thurmond amendment the specification that this new producer of tritium shall be in Savannah River. This is not an appropriate action and certainly it is not an appropriate issue for legislative action.

Decisions like this belong with the administrative branch of our Government. Decisions like this must be based on a complete analysis of many complex technical and economic decisions. A fair and impartial assessment of alternatives for different techniques and sites is what is called for. To think that we, as a Senate, can step in without hearings, without any procedures at all to indicate what would be the proper site for this production facility would be absolutely wrong.

It is clear the reason that this is in the bill is because of the chairman of the committee being from South Carolina. There is no other reason. The fact is there are a number of sites that the Department of Energy and this administration generally are looking at to determine where would be the best place to put it. One of the sites, of course, is at the Nevada test site.

If there were a vote taken today with the people in the Department of Defense, people in the Department of Energy who are making the decision, Nevada would probably win, but that is not how these decisions are made. It is not by a vote. It is by people who are administrators, who listen to the experts who work under them and for them and with them to determine where would be the best place to site this production facility. It certainly should not be done in a site specific amendment as we are now asked to consider.

Why does South Carolina feel that they must legislate the outcome of this issue? Why should not South Carolina and the Members of this Senate be willing to take their chances that their site is the best site?

The junior Senator from New Mexico earlier today in his remarks on the underlying Thurmond amendment indicated that he would not approve of the site specific section of the bill. He said that he would support the Reid amendment, and I think that is the way it should be.

This is not some small project that you can put any place you want. This is a multibillion-dollar project. This is not a project that costs a few million dollars, a few hundred million dollars. This is a project that costs a few billion, and it is simply wrong to site it as has been done by the committee in this bill. This is a multibillion-dollar